



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/709,554	11/13/2000	Duk Chin Chwa	0630-1173P	4510

7590

11/03/2005

Terry L. Clark
B irch Stewart Kolasch & Birch LLP
P O Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/709,554

Applicant(s)

CHWA ET AL.

Examiner

Peng Ke

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-17 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 8, 10-16 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 8/8/05.

Claims 1-8, 10-17, and 20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 8, and 11 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7, 8, 10-14, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews, III et al. (US 6,025,837) in view of Smith (US 5,933,141), further in view of Kim et al. (US 6,788,347).

As per claim 7, Matthews, III et al. teaches a data information display method for a data broadcasting receiver, comprising:

Display an icon for indicating data information reception, on a present audition television picture when the data information is received while a general television picture is displayed; (col. 4, lines 35-58) and

Displaying simple data information on a screen as a simple data information picture in response to a user selection, (col. 4, lines 50-57, col. 5, lines 9-14; Examiner interprets the description to be the summary);

However, Matthews fails to teach wherein the simple data information picture is displayed on a present audition television picture as a font having a translucent ground in order to allow user to

Art Unit: 2174

view the present audition television picture with the simple information picture superimposed over the audition television picture.

Smith teaches wherein the simple data information picture is displayed on a present audition television picture as a font having a translucent ground in order to enable a view to view the present audition television picture with the simple information picture superimposed over the audition television picture (col. 7, lines 40-68, col. 8, lines 1-34).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Smith's teaching with method of Matthews III in order to allow the user to view the additional information while still viewing the television source.

However, Matthews, III et al. and Smith fail to teach displaying size in information identifying a size of a television picture to be displayed with a detail version of the data information.

Kim et al. teaches displaying size in information identifying a size of a television picture to be displayed with a detail version of the data information. (fig. 10, col. 32, lines 32-58)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Kim's teaching with method of Matthews III and Smith in order to allow the user to select a preferred mapping between the aspect ratio of the received video signal and the aspect ratio of the display device.

As per claim 8, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 7. (supra)

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 8, Matthews, III et al, Smith and Kim teach the method of claim 8. Matthews further teaches where in the simple data information picture

Art Unit: 2174

displays simple information including title information among the data information. (column 8, lines 50-65)

As per claim 11, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 7. (supra)

As per claim 12, Matthew, III et al., Smith and Kim teach the data information display apparatus according to claim 11. Matthew III further teaches wherein the PE unit comprises:

a parsing unit for parsing the data information outputted from the data receiving unit(col. 8, lines 6-20);

a formatting unit for formatting the data information outputted from the parsing unit after being analyzed for display; and a display unit for transmitting the data information formatted by the formatting unit to the screen after processing the data information have a displayable format (col. 8, lines 36-51).

As per claim 13, Matthew, III et al., Smith and Kim teach the data information display apparatus according to claim 12. Matthew III further teaches wherein the PE unit further comprises:

a user interface for inputting signals to the parsing unit according to a user input (col. 9, lines 65-68, col. 10, line 1-10).

As per claim 14, Matthew, III et al., Smith and Kim teach the data information display apparatus according to claim 12. Matthew III further teaches wherein the parsing unit further comprises:

a summary information extracting unit for extracting abridged data information of the data information (col. 9, lines 65-68, col. 10, line 1-10).

AsS per claim 20, Matthew, III et al., Smith and Kim teach the data information display apparatus according to claim 11. Matthew III further teaches wherein the PE unit displays on the screen, both first and second selectors when the data information is detected, the first selector for displaying a summary version of the detected data information, the second selector for displaying a detailed version of the detected data information, and the simple data information is displayed in response to a selection of the first selector (col. 9, lines 65-68, col. 10, line 1-10).

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews, III et al. (US 6,025,837) in view of Smith (US 5,933,141), further Kim et al. (US 6,788,347), further in view of Peyer et al. (US 6,564,208), further in view of Garber (US 6,560,616).

As per claim 15, Matthews, III et al., Smith and Kim teach the data information display apparatus according to claim 12, wherein the parsing unit parses the data information outputted from the data receiving unit by using a HTML document (col. 10, lines 30-35). However, he fails to teach using a CSS Parser and Java Script.

Peyer et al. teaches Java Script as part of the data information (col. 4, lines 27-34). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Peyer et al.'s teaching with apparatus of Matthews, III et al., Smith and Kim in order to provide user with access to the web browser, such as status lines, window positions and characteristics, date and time value, and a host of other features.

Garber teaches using a CSS Parser (col. 8, lines 25-29). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Garber's teaching with apparatus of Matthews, III

et al. Smith, Kim and Peyer et al. in order to allow the user to reconstruct the original text from the internet.

As per claim 16, Matthew, III et al., Smith, Kim, Peyer and Garber teach the data information display apparatus according to claim 15. Matthew, III et al. further teaches wherein the summary information extracting unit extracts title information and, television related link information from the HTML document (col. 9, lines 65-68, col. 10, line 1-10).

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments filed on 8/08/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues Kim fails to teach identifying a picture size of a general television picture to be displayed with a detailed version of the data information.

Examiner disagrees. The examiner does not agree for the following reasons:

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given >their< broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." > In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 2174

In this case, Kim teaches this limitation because the content displayed within items a-f in figure 10 are detailed version of the data information.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-6, and 17 are allowed.

The prior art fails to disclose or teach “display simple data information on the screen as a simple data information picture by using the extracted summary information in response to a selection of the first selector, the simple data information including size information identifying a size of a television picture to be display with the detailed version of the HTML document” in combination with the other claim limitations of the succeeding claims.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100